

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated October 27, 2005, the Office rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 22 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first and second paragraphs. Still further, claims 18 and 21 were objected to because it was the Office's view that the reference made to a "fluid stream" in claim 18, and to the "substantially inert carrier fluid" in claim 21 appeared to be directed to the same thing.

With respect to the rejection of 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, the Office indicated that neither the specification nor the claims defined the inert fluid in claim 7; the second fluid stream of claim 10; the substantially inert fluid of claim 14; and the second fluid stream of claim 15. With respect to this rejection, the Office will see that the Applicants' have amended paragraph 0021 to indicate that the substantially inert fluid is any liquid which is not adversely chemically reactive with the reactant compound 40. This appears to be quite evident from the disclosure and therefore it is Applicants' view that this amendment does not constitute new matter.

Still further, the Office rejected claims 1, 10, 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph because it was the view of the Office that the disclosure was not enabling in explaining how merely pumping a fluid to a container with a charging pump increases the pressure of liquid within the container. In this regard, the Office is incorrect in their view that the charging pump is merely for transporting liquid water into the container. Charging pumps are well known, and they are designed to not only deliver fluid, but continue to forcibly deliver fluid in order to increase the pressure of same. Such charging pumps are similar, in principal, to the hydraulic pumps which are commonly utilized in hydraulic rams which are used on heavy equipment and the like. Consequently, the Applicants' are of the view that the specification is enabling and one skilled in the

art would understand the nature of the charging pump required to implement the methodology of the present invention.

Claims 1, 2, 10 and 18 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph because the Office was of the view that the term "high pressure" was indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims in order to delete this terminology. However, in the specification, the Office should note that the Applicants' have disclosed a water pressure within the container which would be greater than 100 pounds per square inch. Consequently, the hydrogen gas pressure produced would be equal to or greater than 100 pounds per square inch. One skilled in the art would recognize that gas pressures of greater than 100 pounds per square inch, would be considered high pressure. The other objections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph appear to be obviated by means of the present amendments, and favorable action with respect to the claims as currently amended is respectfully solicited in the Office's next action.

It is noted that none of the present claims in the application are rejected for obviousness or anticipated under 35 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 103, respectively.

In view of the amendments to the specification, claims and abstract, it would appear that this application is now in condition for allowance, and prompt efforts in issuing a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Applicants, by and through their counsel, would request that the Office telephone the attorney listed below, in the event that a further telephone conference could expedite the prompt handling of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2 JAN 2006

By: _____



Stephen R. Christian
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 32,687
P.O. Box 1625
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415-3899
(208) 526-1371